1	KEITH R. SCHIRMER, Esq. (087691)			
2	JULIA LEVITSKAIA, Esq. (286042) EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP			
3	2300 Contra Costa Boulevard, Suite 450 Pleasant Hill, CA 94523-3936			
4	Telephone: (925) 827-3300 Facsimile: (925) 827-3320			
5	Attorneys for Defendant STEPHEN TANABE Brian Gearinger, Esq.			
6	R. Stephen M. Laroe, Esq. GEARINGER LAW GROUP			
7	825 Van Ness Avenue, 4 th Floor San Francisco, CA 94109-7847			
8	Telephone: (415) 440-3102 Attorneys for Plaintiff			
10	Andrew C. Schwartz, Esq. LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK			
11	2121 N. California Blvd., Suite 1020 Walnut Creek, CA 94596-7333			
12	Telephone: 925-947-1147 Attorneys for Plaintiff			
13	30			
14 15	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT			
16	NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA			
17	HASAN ARDA AKSU,) CASE NO	: C12-4268 CRB	
18	Plaintiff,	Order	TED REQUEST FOR ORDER	
19	vs.	CHANGIN	NG TIME OF BRIEFING LE FOR DEFENDANT	
20	COUNTY OF CONTRA COSTA, SUZANNE PORTER, TERRENCE	TANABE'	S MOTION FOR TIVE ORDER	
21	THOMPSON, CHRISTOPHER BUTLER, BENNY CHETCUTI, JR., STEPHEN TANABE, SHERIFF DAVID LIVINGSTON	Date: Time:	October 10, 2014 10:00 a.m.	
22	and DOES ONE to FIFTY, inclusive,	Location:	Courtroom 6 450 Golden Gate Avenue	
23	Defendants.	Judge:	San Francisco, CA Hon. Charles R. Breyer	
24)	·	
25	Pursuant to Civil Local Rule 6-2, the parties, plaintiff HASAN ARDA AKSU, and			
26	defendant STEPHEN TANABE, by and through their respective counsel, hereby stipulate that			
27 28	plaintiff's time to file their opposition to defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting			
40	1			
	STIPULATED REQUEST FOR ORDER CHANGING TIME OF BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR			

STIPULATED REQUEST FOR ORDER CHANGING TIME OF BRIEFING SCHEDULE FOR DEFENDANT TANABE'S MOTION FOR PROTECTIVE ORDER

Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information (re-filed on August 19, 2014) currently due September 2, 2014, is hereby extended to September 19, 2014; and, defendant's reply to plaintiff's opposition is likewise extended to be due September 26, 2014, for the following reason: parties are presently engaged in efforts to resolve their discovery dispute by stipulation. Granting an extension of time for the parties to file their responsive briefs will provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Self Self					
reply to plaintiff's opposition is likewise extended to be due September 26, 2014, for the following reason: parties are presently engaged in efforts to resolve their discovery dispute by stipulation. Granting an extension of time for the parties to file their responsive briefs will provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Solution Schirmer	1	Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information (re-filed on August 19, 2014)			
following reason: parties are presently engaged in efforts to resolve their discovery dispute by stipulation. Granting an extension of time for the parties to file their responsive briefs will provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Solution Schirmer	2	currently due September 2, 2014, is hereby extended to September 19, 2014; and, defendant's			
stipulation. Granting an extension of time for the parties to file their responsive briefs will provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Schirmer	3	reply to plaintiff's opposition is likewise extended to be due September 26, 2014, for the			
provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Solution Schirmer	4	following reason: parties are presently engaged in efforts to resolve their discovery dispute by			
stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Schirmer	5	stipulation. Granting an extension of time for the parties to file their responsive briefs will			
extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Ss/ Keith R. Schirmer	6	provide the parties additional time to review the records in dispute and determine whether a			
Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP Solution Schirmer	7	stipulation regarding the records' confidentiality may be reached, if at all. The proposed			
10 is reached. IT IS SO STIPULATED. 12 DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP 13 /s/ Keith R. Schirmer 15 16 17 DATED: August 22, 2014 GEARINGER LAW GROUP 18 /s/ Brian Gearinger 20 DATED: August 22, 2014 LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK 21 DATED: August 22, 2014 LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK 22 Z3 Andrew C. Schwartz 24 Z5 26 TI IS SO ORDERED. 27 Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 28 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 29 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 20 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 21 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 22 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 23 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 24 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 25 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 26 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 27 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 28 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 29 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 20 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 21 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 22 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 21 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 22 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 23 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 24 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 25 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 25 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 26 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 26 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 27 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT 27 JUDGE OF TH	8	extension of time will not alter this court's hearing date on defendant's Motion for Protective			
IT IS SO STIPULATED.	9	Order Restricting Disclosure of Confidential, Private and Sensitive Information if no stipulation			
DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP 13	10	is reached.			
13	11	IT IS SO STIPULATED.			
14	12	DATED: August 22, 2014 EDRINGTON, SCHIRMER & MURPHY LLP			
Keith R. Schirmer	13				
DATED: August 22, 2014 GEARINGER LAW GROUP	14				
DATED: August 22, 2014 Searinger Searinger	15				
17 18	16	DATED: Assessed 22, 2014 CEADINGED LAW CROUD			
Brian Gearinger DATED: August 22, 2014 LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK /s/ Andrew C. Schwartz IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	17	DATED: August 22, 2014 GEARINGER LAW GROUP			
DATED: August 22, 2014 LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK /s/ Andrew C. Schwartz IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	18	/s/			
DATED: August 22, 2014 LAW OFFICES OF CASPER, MEADOWS, SCHWARTZ & COOK /s/ Andrew C. Schwartz IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	19	Brian Gearinger			
SCHWARTZ & COOK 23 /s/ Andrew C. Schwartz 24 25 26 1T IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	20				
22 23 24 25 26 27 Date: August 25, 2014 28 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	21				
Andrew C. Schwartz Andrew C. Schwartz IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	22				
25 26 IT IS SO ORDERED. 27 Date: August 25, 2014 28 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	23				
IT IS SO ORDERED. Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT	24				
Date: August 25, 2014 JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT		IT IS SO ODDEDED			
JUDGE OF THE DISTRICT COURT					
	28	2			